

3

As per cause title.

(149)

HIGH COURT OF CHHATTISGARH AT BILASPUR

Writ Petition No. 1911 of 2004

Petitioner

Dilip Kumar Hedau

Versus

Respondents

State of Chhattisgarh and another

Single Bench : Hon'ble Mr. Justice Satish K. Agnihotri.

Shri Prashant Jayaswal, Senior Advocate with Shri Ali Asgar, Advocate for the petitioner.

Shri V. V. S. Moorthy, Deputy Advocate General for the respondent No.1.

Shri Pradeep Saxena, Advocate for the Intervener.

Shri J. K. Shastri, Advocate for the Intervener Shri K. R. Sahu.

ORAL ORDER

(6th April, 2006)

The following order of the Court was passed by **Satish K. Agnihotri, J.**

1. The petitioner was appointed as Assistant Manager in the Khadi Avam Gram Udyog Board (Hasht Shilp Prakostha) vide order dated 8.6.1992 (Annexure P/2) in the category of Scheduled Tribe on the basis of the caste certificate produced by the petitioner that he belongs to 'halba' tribe.
2. Some complaints were made to the Government against several persons, including the petitioner, that they have been appointed on the basis of false caste certificates, produced by them. On the basis of the said complaints the State Government by letter dated 22.6.2004 (Annexure P/9) directed all the concerned officers, not to consider the cases of such candidates, against whom complaints with regard to false caste certificate is pending, for promotion to the higher post.
3. The petitioner has filed this petition praying that the pending enquiry, the petitioner has acquired right to be considered for promotion to the

higher post. At this stage the petitioner seeks permission of this Court to withdraw this petition with liberty to question the action of the State Government as and when occasion arises. It is further submitted that the State Government be directed to conclude the enquiry as early as possible because the petitioner is being deprived of his right for consideration to promotion.

4. In view of the foregoing, this petition is dismissed as withdrawn, reserving liberty to the petitioner to take appropriate steps as and when cause of action arises. The Respondent/State is directed to complete the enquiry, as early as possible, preferably within a period of three months from the date of receipt of a copy of this order, as the impugned order was passed on 22.6.2004, directing the concerned officers not to consider the cases of those candidates against whom complaints with regard to false caste certificate is pending.
5. No order as to costs.

Sd/-
Satish K. Agnihotri
Judge